To:

Enck.Judith@epamail.epa.gov;king.david@epa.gov;Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov;CN=Benny Conetta/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;fischer.douglas@epa.gov[];

ing.david@epa.gov;Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov;CN=Benny

Conetta/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;fischer.douglas@epa.gov[];

arbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov;CN=Benny

Conetta/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA; fischer.douglas@epa.gov[]; N=Benny

Conetta/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;fischer.douglas@epa.gov[]; ischer.douglas@epa.gov[]

Cc: CN=Lisa Plevin/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
Bcc: CN=Walter Mugdan/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US[]
From: CN=Walter Mugdan/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US

Sent: Wed 8/11/2010 8:55:11 PM

Subject: Fw: Follow-up from Hudson Conference Call

http://www.hudsondredging.com/about the project/key technical reports/

FYI, here is a copy (without attachments) of a note I just sent to the trustee representatives:

---- Forwarded by Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US on 08/11/2010 04:53 PM -----

From: Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US

To: aoguglie@gw.dec.state.ny.us, Craig.R.O'Connor@noaa.gov, John.Davis@oag.state.ny.us, kxfarrar@gw.dec.state.ny.us, Marguerite.Matera@noaa.gov, mark.barash@sol.doi.gov, marvin_moriarty@fws.gov, Robert.Haddad@noaa.gov, Robert_Foley@fws.gov, Tom.Brosnan@NOAA.gov, Wendi_Weber@fws.gov, sfgruski@gw.dec.state.ny.us, ahcrocke@gw.dec.state.ny.us, Eugene.Leff@ag.ny.gov

Date: 08/11/2010 04:53 PM

Subject: Follow-up from Hudson Conference Call

Colleagues,

Thanks again for participating in the conference call this morning. With this message I am forwarding to you two documents that we discussed. The first is a copy of a presentation GE gave us during a meeting on July 1. It summarizes certain information from GE's modeling-related work. (That work is described in greater detail in documents that are posted on GE's web site at:

http://www.hudsondredging.com/about_the_project/key_technical_reports/ under the heading: "The Upper Hudson River Modeling System -- June 28, 2010.") The attached July 1 presentation explains how GE calculated the 920 kg load that it now asserts is the maximum that should be allowed to move into the lower Hudson as a result of dredging.

The second attached document is a draft memo that sets out some of our initial reactions to and observations about GE's 920 kg assertion. (This memo is being revised on a near daily basis, and will likely continue to evolve from the attached version.)

We spoke today about having a follow-up technical meeting to discuss in greater detail the issues you have raised. For the next two weeks we will be fully occupied reviewing the draft peer review report, which is expected on August 13. I and others will be out all or part of the week of August 30. I therefore propose that we try to schedule the technical meeting during the following week. At the moment, it appears that September 7, 8 and 10 would all be possible for us. I suggest the representatives of the various Trustee agencies confer and let me know whether any of those three dates would work for you and, if so, what time of day would be most convenient.

In this connection I note that Judith Enck's office today sent out an invitation for a meeting on September 21. I think it is important that we try to meet earlier so that we have more time to understand and consider your concerns. Also, we expect to be extremely busy in the latter part of September as we try to finalize our decisions about the performance standards and design criteria. I hope, therefore, that you will be able to meet during the week of September 7, and that this may obviate the need to meet on September 21.

Finally, please forward this message to any of your colleagues whom I may have inadvertently omitted from the address list.

•

[attachment "2010-07-01 EPA meeting.pdf" deleted by Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US] [attachment "Model Review-6.doc" deleted by Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US]